

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Examiner's Office Action. To further prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 19, cancelled claims 5-6 and 15-16, and added claims 20- 22. New claims 20-22 do not add new subject matter to the present application and have antecedent basis. Claims 1-5, 8-14 and 17-22 are currently pending with claims 1, 10, 19, 20, 21 and 22 in independent form. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 8-12, 15 and 17-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 8-12 and 17-19 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,643,566 to Lehr et al. ("Lehr") in view of U.S. 6,792,321 to Sepe Jr. ("Sepe"). In addition, claims 6 and 15 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lehr in view of Sepe and in further view of U.S. 6,545,481 to Emberty et al. ("Emberty"). Claims 6 and 15 have been cancelled herein from the present application. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 8-12, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for the reasons given below.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation recited in claim 6. Amended claim 1, therefore, is directed to a system comprising an input that receives power from a primary power source, and a plurality of outputs coupled to the input. The plurality of outputs is adapted to provide power to a plurality of equipment. The system also includes a network interface adapted to receive control, configuration and status information from a plurality of wireless devices and to generate a plurality of control signals representing the control, configuration and status information, and a processor coupled to the network interface and to the plurality of outputs. The processor is adapted to receive and respond to the plurality of control signals by actuating the plurality of outputs. The system further includes an uninterruptible power supply system comprising a secondary power source adapted to provide power to the plurality of equipment, a sensing circuit coupled to the input to detect if the primary power source is below a predetermined threshold, and a control switch adapted to couple the secondary power source to the plurality of equipment if the sensing circuit detects that the primary power source is below the predetermined threshold.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 as being unpatentable over Lehr in view of Sepe and in further view of Emberty. The Examiner indicates that Lehr does not specifically disclose the details of an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) and, in particular, does not disclose a sensing circuit and a control switch for coupling a secondary power source to the plurality of equipment. However, the Examiner indicates that Emberty teaches a sensing circuit and a control switch. The Examiner, therefore, concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lehr and Sepe to use a sensing circuit and a control switch.

Applicants respectfully submit that the filing date of Emberty is November 20, 2000, while the filing date of the present application is October 27, 2000, by virtue of Applicants' claim of the benefit of the earlier filing date of a provisional patent application, Application Serial No. 60/243,953, as indicated in the present application's Filing Receipt and specification on page 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that Emberty cannot serve as a prior art reference to the present application either alone or in the cited combination of references.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Emberty cannot be included in the cited combination of references. Applicants further submit that Lehr alone or in combination with Sepe does not provide a teaching or suggestion that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lehr and Sepe to achieve the system of claim 1 having a UPS with a sensing circuit and a control switch. Claim 1, therefore, is patentably distinguishable from Lehr in view of Sepe. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3 and 8-9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons given above. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-3 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejection of claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit claim 10 has been amended herein to include the limitation recited in claim 15 and, therefore, is patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art references for at least the reasons given above with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-12 and 17-18 depend from claim 10 and are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, the rejection of claims 11-12 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 19, claim 19 has been amended herein and is directed to a method of controlling a system comprising receiving control, configuration and status information from a plurality of wireless devices at the system, and generating a plurality of control signals at the system representing the control, configuration and status information. The method also comprises communicating the plurality of control signals to a plurality of outputs located on the system to selectively actuate the outputs to selectively power-on or power-off a plurality of equipment or components coupled to the plurality of outputs. The method further comprises providing an uninterruptible power supply system including a secondary power source adapted to provide power to the plurality of equipment or components, a sensing circuit coupled to an input to detect if a primary power source is below a predetermined threshold, and a control switch adapted to couple the secondary power source to the plurality of equipment or components if the sensing circuit detects that the primary power source is below the predetermined threshold.

The Examiner indicates that Lehr discloses the method as claimed with the exception Lehr does not specifically disclose that the control, configuration and status information may be received from a plurality of wireless devices. However, the Examiner further indicates that Sepe provides such teaching. Therefore, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lehr to include receiving control, configuration and status information from a plurality of wireless devices.

Amended claim 19 includes providing an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system adapted to provide power from a secondary power source if a primary power source is below a predetermined threshold. The USP system includes a sensing circuit coupled to an input to detect if the primary power source is below a predetermined threshold and a control switch adapted to couple the secondary power source to the plurality of equipment or components if the sensing circuit detects the primary power source is below the predetermined threshold.

As the Examiner knows, obviousness can only be established when there is some teaching, suggestion or motivation in the prior art references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the teachings of one or more prior art references to achieve the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest providing a UPS system including a secondary power source, a sensing circuit and a control switch as claimed. Therefore, claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references because such combination provides no teaching or suggestion to modify the teachings of Lehr and Sepe to provide the method of claim 19. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehr in view of Sepe and in further view of U.S. 6,333,613 to Lee et al. ("Lee"). Claims 5 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehr in view of Sepe and in further view of Case et al. "RFC 1157: A Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP), May 1990 ("Case"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejecting of claims 4 and 5 and 13 and 14.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claims 4 and 5 should be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10 and are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, the rejection of claims 13 and 14 should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehr in view of Sepe and in further view of Emberty. Claims 7 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehr in view of Sepe and in further view of U.S. 5,281,636 to Baker et al. ("Baker"). Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 have been cancelled herein from the present application.

Patentability of New Claims 20-22


Claims 20 and 21 are each directed to a system that includes a primary power source and a plurality of outlets adapted to provide power to a plurality of equipment. The system of each of claims 20 and 21 also includes a network interface or means, respectively, for receiving control, configuration and status information from a plurality of wireless devices and generating a plurality of control signals representing such information. Such system further includes an intelligent power strip as described in the claims. Applicants respectfully submit the cited combinations of references do not provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation such that one of ordinary skill in the art would modify and/or combine the teachings of the prior art to obtain the invention of claims 20 and 21. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Baker, Lehr or Sepe, either alone or in combination that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Lehr and Sepe to include the power strip of Baker and thereby achieve the system of claim 20 or 21. Thus, claims 20 and 21 are patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art.

With respect to new method claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claims 20 and 21, claim 22 is patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and discussion, the present application is believe to be in condition for allowance, and an action to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, he is invited to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees required for this amendment and response to the deposit account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0311, referencing Attorney Docket No. 18133-071.

Respectfully submitted,



Carol H. Peters

Registration No. 45,010

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS  
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

One Financial Center

Boston, MA 02111

Telephone: 617/348-4914

Facsimile: 617/542-2241

email: [cpeters@mintz.com](mailto:cpeters@mintz.com)

Date: April 18, 2005

TRA 2027499v1